

**REMARKS**

All rejections and objections are moot in view of the amendments to the claims.

It is unclear why some of the product claims are identified as withdrawn in view of the indication that the elected and examined matter includes compounds where R, R1-R3 and Y are as defined, and X and X' are Csaba Henter groups. For example, in claim 7, a narrower definition of R3 is present than in claim 1. The same issue is present in all remaining withdrawn product claims, including now independent claim 15, which recites a subgroup of compounds of independent claim 1. Accordingly, these claims should not have been restricted.

Additionally, applicants bring the attention of the Examiner to MPEP § 821.04, Rejoinder, which states that “if the elected invention is directed to the product and the claims directed to the product are subsequently found patentable, process claims [both process of making and using] which either depend from or include all the limitations of the allowable product will be rejoined.” Accordingly, the rejoinder of the non-elected claims is respectfully requested in accord with the rejoinder provisions of the MPEP.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Csaba Henter/

---

Csaba Henter, Reg. No. 50,908  
Attorney for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.  
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1  
2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1400  
Arlington, VA 22201  
Direct Dial: 703-812-5331  
Facsimile: 703-243-6410  
Attorney Docket No.:MERCK-3190

Date: September 23, 2009